

mas

3499

RECORD
COPY

JPRS: 3499

11 July 1960

MAIN FILE

V. I. LENIN ON THE LAWS GOVERNING THE METAMORPHOSIS
OF SOCIALISM INTO COMMUNISM

- USSR -

By K. P. Abrosenko

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

19990112 129

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42ND STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

F O R E W A R D

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

JPRS: 3499

CSO: 3730-D

V. I. LENIN ON THE LAWS GOVERNING THE METAMORPHOSIS
OF SOCIALISM INTO COMMUNISM

- USSR -

[Following is a translation of an article by K. P. Abrosenko in the Russian-language periodical Voprosy istorii KPSS (Problems of the History of the CPSU), Moscow, Vol. 4, No. 1, 1960, pages 16-33.]

In the period of the all-out construction of a Communist society, questions of Marxist-Leninist theory which relate to the transition from socialism to Communism become exceptionally topical. In order to build Communism surely and successfully, one must know and be able to utilize the laws governing its development. That is why the 21st Party Congress, outlining the grandiose program of the construction of a Communist society in our country, set forth and worked out a number of theoretical problems of Communism. On the basis of an analysis and generalization of the practice of the construction of socialism and Communism in the USSR and of the experience of socialist countries, the Congress gave concrete form to and creatively developed the theory of the metamorphosis of socialism into Communism, thus making an important contribution to the science of Marxism-Leninism.

Working out the problems of the transition to Communism, the Communist Party again turned to the rich Leninist heritage on questions of scientific Communism and was guided by the immortal ideas of the great Lenin. Developing the Marxist teaching on the two phases of Communist society, Lenin marked out the basic paths for the metamorphosis of socialism into Communism and pointed out the basic objective and subjective factors which would guarantee an undeviating and rapid development of this process.

The study of Leninist ideas on Communism, taking into account those new factors which the practice of the setting up of our new system has introduced into the theory, is presently one of the most important tasks of the ideological work of the Party and of the task of propagandizing the historic decisions of the 21st Party Congress.

* * *

K. Marx laid down the basis of the science of the two phases of a Communist society. In the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" and in other works, Marx laid the scientific basis for the proposition that Communism inevitably passes through two main phases, or states, in its development. This is because the Communist structure, by virtue of the ineluctable progressive march of the historical process, rises on the base of the preceding structure--capitalism. Therefore, in the

first stage of its development, which the founders of Marxism called socialism, the Communist society "in all its aspects--economic, moral, and intellectual--still retains the birthmarks of the old society, from whose bowels it arose" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Soch. [Works], Vol. XV, p 274). In this stage society gradually frees itself from the legacy of the past and creates the distinctive material and spiritual foundation of Communism, on which the formation of the new social order is then completed. Explaining this thesis, Lenin said: "... socialism is that society which grows directly out of capitalism; it is the first phase of the new society. Communism, on the other hand, is a higher form of society, and it can develop only when socialism is completely consolidated." (V. I. Lenin, Soch., [Works], Vol. 30, p. 260).

Lenin developed Marx' teachings into a coherent science on the two phases of Communist society. He showed that socialism and Communism are two levels in one and the same social formation, distinguished from one another only by the degree of their economic, political, and cultural maturity. Both phases must of necessity have features in common, features which are inherent in the Communist structure as a whole.

Characterizing the common features of the two phases of Communism, Lenin emphasized that socialism and Communism are that type of social organization which unites industry and agriculture on the principles of the social production and public ownership of the means of production. "To the extent that the means of production become common property," wrote Lenin, characterizing the essence of socialism, "to that extent the word 'communism' is applicable here too, so long as we do not forget that this is not full communism" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol 25, p. 442).

One and the same economic foundation--a unified social method of production and public ownership of the means of production; a planned and balanced development of all branches of the national economy; the subordination of production to the fullest satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of all members of society; work according to ability as the foremost duty before society; the monolithic unity of all society, achieved as a result of the liquidation of class and national antagonisms; the dominance of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook in the ideological field--these are what constitutes the common characteristics of socialism and Communism and what differentiates the new structure as a whole from all preceding societies.

Socialism is the first phase, the lower level of the development of Communist society. Therefore it has a number of features which are characteristic only for this phase and which mark its relative immaturity in comparison with full Communism.

In the stage of socialism, public ownership of the means of production assumes two forms: the form of state ownership, belonging to the whole people, which developed as a result of the victory of the socialist revolution and the expropriation of the capitalists and

landowners; and the form of cooperative-holkhoz ownership, which arose as a result of the cooperativization of individual peasant farms. The economic foundation of Communism will consist of a single Communist ownership which will develop as a result of the gradual merging of the two forms of ownership characteristic of socialism.

During the transition to socialism the exploiting classes are liquidated, and therefore class antagonism in society is eliminated. But in the conditions of socialism the class structure of society is still retained. It is characterized by the presence of two classes--the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry, and also by a social stratum, the intelligentsia. Both these classes and the intelligentsia make up a single friendly family of partners in the struggle for Communism, welded together by an identity of interests and aims by the unified leadership of the Communist Party. But among them differences still exist, differences which are determined by the fact that under socialism, in addition to the existence of two forms of public ownership, the essential differences, inherited from the whole previous history of mankind, between town and country and between mental and physical labor, still persist.

Under Communism, on the basis of a single Communist ownership, the development of the productive forces and the cultural-technical training of all members of society will reach a level under which the essential differences between town and country and between physical and mental labor will disappear. Together with this, the essential differences between the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia will disappear, and society will be transformed into a classless union of free toilers who will possess and work on common means of production according to a common plan and under working conditions similar in nature in industry as well as in agriculture. "The future society, towards which we are striving," said Lenin, "is a society in which there should be only workers, a society in which there must not be any differences..." (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 29, p. 297)

An indicator of the insufficient economic maturity of the first phase of Communism by comparison with the higher phase is the socialist principle of distribution according to work. Lenin taught that until an abundance of goods is created, until the essential difference between mental and physical work is overcome and people are accustomed to work voluntarily for the common good, without control by society and without consideration for compensation--until that time society must regulate the work and the amount of goods everyone receives, using as a method of such control the socialist principle of distribution according to work. Under Communism, the above-mentioned conditions will be created, and society will be able to go over to the higher and more perfected principle of distribution--from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.

Lenin wrote: "Politically, the difference between the first, or lower, and the higher phase of Communism will in time be tremendous, most likely..." (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 25, p. 442). In the first phase of Communism the organization of society has a political character--the state and law are in evidence and act as the: 1) means for socialist transformations and for the construction of Communism (while the organizational functions for the administration of the economy, of things, are carried out through the administration of people); 2) tools for the security and support of the social order (while not all the people are used to carrying out their social obligations and the rules of human social life without a special apparatus of coercion); 3) means for the security of public property and for control over the rate of work and consumption (while the socialist principle of distribution is in force, and the principle of the sanctity and inviolability of public property has not become all-embracing); 4) instruments for the defense of the country against attack from without (while capitalist encirclement or the threat of aggression by the remaining capitalist states exists).

The transition to full Communism will mean the gradual disappearance of political organizations and political organs of administration. The state, and together with it, the law, will die out. Communist society will be a self-administering society of highly conscious and free people voluntarily carrying out the principles of Communism and the norms of human social living which will have become consolidated in the social consciousness as natural and normal rules of behavior.

And so, those features of socialism which distinguish it as the lower phase of the Communist structure are objectively conditioned by the nature of the rise of socialism and also by the level of the development of the production forces and the cultural state of society reached in this stage. But these features are transitory. Lenin noted that socialism is not something dead, frozen, settled once and for all, but a living social organism, steadily growing into a higher social type. Socialism already bears those characteristics, and in its bosom are growing and ripening those shoots of the new [see Note] on the basis of which the foundation is created for the replacement of the lower phase of Communism by the higher. At the same time, this foundation is created by the all-round development of those transitional features of socialism which distinguish it from the higher phase of the Communist society. There is no contradiction here; for only by the all-round development of the specific characteristics of socialism, by the complete exhaustion of those potentialities which they provide for the growth of the productivity of social labor and the development of a Communist consciousness among the masses, can the material and spiritual prerequisites be created which are necessary for the dying out of those characteristics and for the transition to the higher phase, to Communism. In this instance, we are referring to those characteristics which are inherent in socialism by its very

nature. As for the so-called "birthmarks," the survivals of capitalism inherited from the past, which are alien to the nature of the socialist system and restrain its development, the process of the building of socialism and Communism is, from its very inception, the process of struggle against and overcoming these survivals.

([Note:] The shoots of Communist relations begin their growth from the first days of the building of socialism. As the transition to the higher phase of Communist society progresses, they grow quantitatively and take on a tremendous social importance as visible features of Communism. This is sharply manifested at the present time, when new forms of Communist labor and the organization of production and different social forms for the satisfaction of the needs of the citizens are developing (boarding schools, kindergartens, creches, public dining rooms, communal services, et al.).

(Lenin often pointed out the necessity for an attentive attitude and constant concern for the development of everything new that arises, everything communist. Model production, communist Saturdays, a fastidious and conscientious attitude toward work, model dining halls and clean workers' houses and quarters--all this he considered shoots of Communism, and he looked upon concern for these things as a foremost obligation of society. While proletarian state power is being maintained, Lenin wrote, "the shoots of communism will not wither, but will grow apace and unfold into communism" (Soch., Vol. 29, p. 397.)

And so, Marxist-Leninist teaching on the two phases of Communist society reveals the following picture of the dialectic process of the growth of the lower phase of Communism into the higher. The metamorphosis of victorious socialism into full Communism will progress by means of the strengthening of further all-round development of the shoots of the future society which rise up in the conditions of socialism, and of those characteristics which are common to both phases, and also by means of overcoming the survivals of capitalism and the all-round development, the fullest utilization, and the subsequent withering away of those features which distinguish socialism as a lower phase from Communism as a higher and most perfected level of social development.

* * * *

Revealing the general character of the movement of society from socialism to Communism, Lenin pointed out that this movement is the natural law of the process of the steady and uninterrupted transformation of the lower phase of Communist society into the higher phase. "From capitalism," Lenin taught, "mankind can directly pass over only to socialism, that is, to the common ownership of the means of production and to the distribution of goods according to the amount of work each one performs. Our party looks farther ahead: socialism must inevitably pass over gradually into communism, the banner of which reads -- "to each according to his ability, to each according to his need" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 24, p. 62). Lenin never set down a

definite time schedule or the concrete forms for the transition to Communism. "No form," he said, "will be conclusive until full communism is attained. We have not pretended to know the precise road. But we are going towards communism inevitably and unswervingly" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 28, p. 195). But one thing is clear, Lenin emphasized, and that is that the transition to Communism is a process of accelerated development; for the socialist revolution creates accelerators of the social process unprecedented in their force, such as common ownership of the means of production and the active participation of the multi-million popular masses in the construction of the new system. Lenin wrote that "only socialism will mark the beginning of a rapid, real, truly mass--with the participation of the majority and then of the entire people--vital movement forward in all areas of public and private life" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 25, p. 443).

On the basis of these Leninist instructions, and analyzing the conditions for the large-scale building of Communism, N. S. Khrushchev drew three important conclusions in his report to the 21st Party Congress: 1) The transition from the socialist stage of development to the higher phase is an historical law of development which can be neither deliberately violated nor evaded. The Communist Party, studying the developmental laws of this process and skilfully employing them, organizes the creation of the material and spiritual prerequisites for a planned transition to Communism. 2) Communism grows out of socialism as its direct continuation. There is no wall between these phases, and the entry into Communism is not determined by any date on the calendar. The transition from the lower to the higher phase of Communism is an uninterrupted process. Therefore we are now already opening the door to a Communist society; the building of this society is the topic of today. 3) The gradualness of the transition to Communism does not mean it is a slow movement. On the contrary, this is a period of the stormy development of the entire economy and culture with the active and conscious participation of millions of builders of the new society. "The process of the natural laws of the metamorphosis of socialism into Communism can be accelerated on the basis of a highly developed material production, which, indeed, is attained in the period of socialism" ("Extraordinary 21st Party Congress. Stenographic Report," Part I, Moscow, 1959, pp. 94-95)

Now that the Soviet people under the leadership of the Party have arrived at the practical fulfillment of the planned and accelerated transition to Communism, those principles of Lenin are especially timely in which the general, most vital natural laws of Communist construction are revealed.

Lenin taught that the transition to Communism is economically impossible where the state lacks a very powerfully developed heavy industry and a highly developed, large-scale agricultural production (see V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 32, p. 210). These Leninist instructions vividly express one of the most important natural laws of the building

of Communism. It consists in this: the transition to Communism presupposes the creation of such a material-technical base as would ensure the attainment of a high labor productivity, immeasurably surpassing the level attained by present-day society.

Lenin repeatedly emphasized the importance of labor productivity, considering it the main material factor determining, in the final analysis, the victory of the new social order. In "A Great Initiative" he wrote: "Capitalism can be and will be decisively vanquished by the fact that socialism creates a new, much higher productivity of labor" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 29, p. 394). Lenin is here posing with the fullest clarity the question of the economic competition of the two systems. He points out that in this competition the new Communist system, even in the first phase of its development, will inevitably win, having guaranteed a higher labor productivity.

History confirms Lenin's prediction. The Soviet Union--the country of victorious and consolidated socialism--has already surpassed such major capitalist countries as England and France in the level of labor productivity. In this respect it still lags behind the USA, for which exceptionally favorable historical and natural conditions created the opportunity to go far ahead of all countries in the world in level of productivity of social labor. Suffice it to say that even the world wars, which broke on mankind as a terrible catastrophe causing tremendous damage to the national economy of almost all countries, turned out to be a source of new enrichment for the USA. In his report to the Second Comintern Congress (1920), Lenin noted that only America gained from the First World War and from having been a debtor to many countries, it became a world creditor to the sum of 19 billion gold rubles (see V. I. Lenin, Sochs., Vol. 31, pp. 193-195). The USA gained even more from the Second World War, having concentrated in its hands more than half of the gold reserve of the capitalist world. At the same time, 18 years of the 42-year-old history of the Soviet state were spent on wars unleashed against us and on subsequent economic reconstruction. The invasion of Hitlerite Germany alone wreaked damage on the Soviet Union which, together with military expenditures and temporary losses of income from industry and agriculture in the occupied territories, amounted to 2 trillion, 569 billion rubles. "If these colossal sums," said N. S. Khrushchev, "had been spent on peaceful construction..., we would long ago have had an abundance of material goods" ("Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet USSR, dedicated to the 40th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution (6 Nov 1957). Stenographic Report," Moscow, 1957, p. 19).

In spite of the difficulties of socialist construction and the tremendous losses incurred as a result of wars, the Soviet Union has long ago surpassed the most highly developed capitalist countries, including the USA, in labor productivity growth rates. From 1929-1958, the productivity of social labor in the national economy of the USSR grew 4 times more rapidly than in the USA. Calculations show that in

the course of the next 15 years the Soviet Union will catch up with and then surpass the USA in the level of labor productivity.

Therefore, even in the socialist stage the Communist formation will create a higher labor productivity in comparison with the capitalist system, and by that very fact will win a world historic victory in competition with capitalism. The material-technical achievements of this stage will surpass everything which capitalism is capable of rendering in the sphere of material production. And these achievements will make up that foundation on which the material-technical base of Communism will be formed as its direct continuation and development. In other words, the proper material basis of Communism matures under the conditions of socialism. The fulfillment of the Seven-Year Plan will be a decisive stage in this process.

In his works Lenin profoundly worked out the question of the characteristic features of the material-technical base of Communism, of the paths towards its creation. He taught that the lower phase of Communist society, socialism, is built on the material-technical base created by capitalism. Lenin emphasized that it is impossible to build socialism without the rule of the proletariat in the state and without using the major capitalist technical resources built in accordance with the latest findings of modern science (see V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 32, p. 313).

Exploiting the technical achievements of capitalism, the state of the proletarian dictatorship organizes the creation of the economic foundation of the new social system. Lenin worked out the plan for this construction. Its main elements were the socialist industrialization of the country, the collectivization of agriculture, and a cultural revolution. Together with this, Lenin proposed the idea of the thoroughgoing electrification of the country. He considered the electrification of all spheres of production, of all branches of the national economy, as the basis for the material-technical base of Communism. This is precisely expressed in the well-known formula: "Communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 31, p. 392). Working out the plan for GOELRO [State Commission for the Electrification of Russia], Lenin pointed out: "We must have a new technological base for the new economic construction. This new technological base is electricity" (*ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 310). It is not accidental that Lenin speaks here of electricity as the technical and not the energetics base of the economy of Communism, because he understood by electricity the creation of a modern large-scale machine industry and a highly mechanized agriculture, based on advanced technology.

Lenin's instructions on the creation of the material-technical base of Communism are consistently being implemented by our Party. It is on their foundation that the entire economic policy of the CPSU was and is being built. As a result of the fulfillment of the industrialization plan, there has been created in the USSR a modern industry supplied with the most modern technology, which yielded in 1959 a

production output 36 times greater than industry in Russia produced in 1913. At the same time, the production output of machine building and metal processing increased 240 times, while the electric power output increased 100 times. In the USSR today as much electric power is produced every 3 days as was produced in a whole year in Tsarist Russia. Industry has supplied socialist agriculture with modern machinery. Agriculture now has at its disposal 700,000 tractors (in 15-horsepower units), about 700,000 trucks, 500,000 grain combines, 120,000 reaper and binder combines, and millions of other agricultural machines and implements ("Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, 15-19 December 1958, Stenographic Report," Moscow, 1958, p. 56). As a result of the cultural revolution, the cultural-technical level of the main production force, the toilers, has risen immeasurably; science and technology have registered unprecedented growth. This is convincingly evidenced by the fact that the higher educational institutions of the USSR graduated 106,000 engineers in 1959, that is, 3 times more than in the USA ("To Live in Peace and Friendship;" Visit of N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers to the USA, Moscow, 1959, p. 83). A triumph of Soviet science and technology are the world-shaking successes of our country in the fields of atomic energy, rocket construction, and space conquest.

Thus, as a result of the successful implementation of Lenin's outline for economic revival and socialist construction in Russia, we have at our disposal at the present time all the necessary technical-economic and cultural prerequisites to set about on the practical realization of the tasks of the creation of the material-technical base of Communism.

The 21st Party Congress marked out the paths for the resolution of these tasks. It noted that the material-technical base of Communism will be formed by the fullest development in all areas of the national economy of those scientific-technological elements which were created under socialism. A thoroughgoing development of modern industry on the base of the preferential growth of heavy industry, the completion of the fullest electrification of the country, the fullest use of chemicals, the extensive utilization of new kinds of power and raw materials, complex mechanization and automatization of all production processes--these are the routes of that gigantic technological progress which will lead to the creation of the material-technical base of Communism. It will be a tremendous qualitative jump in the development of the production forces, in the increase in labor productivity.

Full automatization of the entire social production on the base of the latest achievements of science and technology will make up that new quality which will characterize the content of the material-technical base of Communism and its radical difference from the technical foundation of capitalist society. This is why the main direction of the struggle for the construction of the material-technical base of Communism is the complex mechanization and automatization of production

processes in all branches of the national economy--in industry, agriculture, transport. The June (1959) Plenum of the Central Committee CPSU, examining the question of speeding up technological progress, paid special attention to tasks in the field of the complex mechanization and automatization of production. It says in the decree of the Plenum: "The Communist Party considers the complex mechanization and automatization of production processes as the principal means of technological progress, without which high rates of the further growth of labor productivity are impossible" ("Plenum of the Central Committee CPSU, 24-29 June 1959, Stenographic Report," Moscow, 1959, p. 505).

Scientific-technical progress in the conditions of the transformation of socialism into Communism assumes a number of new specific features. It is characterized above all by an intensive acceleration of the development of technological and scientific thought, by the advanced development of production processes. In this connection, the time period of the depreciation of machinery and equipment will be steadily reduced in proportion to the creation of the material-technical base of Communism. "If we were to speculate on how we shall utilize machinery under Communism," said N. S. Khrushchev, "it is clear that equipment will serve effectively for not more than 5 years, and then it will be obsolete. In order to ensure that we shall always be ahead and never lag behind in developing new machinery and equipment, we must have a very good experimentation base, a base for making improvements in order to put new machinery to work quickly. Only under these conditions will we truly be able to move ahead and ensure a high labor productivity. For this, we must think once more about design bureaus, laboratories, and scientific institutions" (*ibid.*, p. 465).

The advanced development of science is the motive force of technical progress. The role of science, of the work of designing new and perfected machinery, will steadily grow in the course of the further development of technological progress, and, in keeping with this, the number of specialists designing new machines in production collectives will also grow, progressively surpassing the number of workers servicing machines and automatized lines.

(This tendency has already begun to make its appearance in the activity of many enterprises and sovnarkoms. Thus, for example, the Leningrad Sovnarkom decided in the course of 1959-1960 to bring the proportion of engineering-technical workers engaged in the technical work of the enterprises up to 40% of the total number of engineering-technical workers in plants and factories. See Partiinaya Zhizn' [Party Life], No. 16, 1959, p. 12.)

In his speech at the June Plenum, N. S. Khrushchev said on this subject: "Under Communism there will be considerably more scientific institutions and designers and other specialists; workers mastering difficult skills will also control complex machines which yield a high productivity" ("Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, 24-29 June 1959, Stenographic Report," Moscow, 1959, p. 457).

These phenomena, which characterize the process of creating the material-technical base of Communism, point up another law of the transformation of socialism into Communism, a law consisting in the fact that the transition to Communism presupposes the all-round development of the individual, leading, on the basis of the thoroughgoing automatization of material production, to the elimination of the essential difference between mental and physical labor.

Lenin pointed out that the transformation of socialism into Communism will be crowned by the transition "to the abolition of the division of labor among people, to the education, training, and preparation of fully developed and fully trained people, people who know how to do everything. Communism comes, must come, and will come to this, but only after a long period of time" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 31, p. 32).

The abolition of the division of labor and the essential difference between mental and physical labor cannot be understood to mean that under Communism physical labor, the differences between various kinds of production, and specialization by the producer will disappear. Under Communism only that subjection to the division of labor which enslaved a man and about which Marx wrote, will disappear. This means that a person will not be tied to one activity for his whole life, his all-sided development and training will permit him to engage in various kinds of activity in industry as well as in agriculture, rationally combining one with the other. The specialization of the producer will be progressively broadened, but it will not disappear entirely. The mechanization and automatization of all forms of production will lead to a reduction of the proportion of manual labor and to a considerable alleviation of physical as well as mental work. But man's labor with its dual sides--physical and mental--will as before constitute the basis of the life of society. It will be free, voluntary labor, converted into habit, into man's first vital necessity.

The training of people for such labor, their education in the spirit of Communist principles, constitute a vital task for a society carrying out the transition from socialism to Communism. "In order to arrive at Communism, at the most just and perfect society where all the best moral qualities of a free man will be completely revealed," said N. S. Khrushchev, "we must already educate the man of the future. We must develop among the Soviet people a Communist morality, in the foundation of which are devotion to Communism and implacability towards its enemies; awareness of social obligation; active participation in work for the good of society; voluntary observance of the basic rules of human communal living, comradely mutual help, honesty, and righteousness; intolerance towards violators of the social order" ("Extraordinary 21st Party Congress, Stenographic Report," Part I, Moscow, 1959, p. 55). In this connection, the reorganization which has taken place in our country in the system of education is of tremendous importance. The basic direction of the reorganization consists in

developing schools closely tied to life, to social production--schools which will ensure a harmonious combination among the young generation of a high order of general education, polytechnical and specialized training, and also of a profound Communist consciousness and morality. It is precisely this kind of training and education for the youth which characterize the process of the formation of the all-round development of the individual, of the member of a Communist society.

The education of the man of the future is one of the most difficult tasks of Communist construction. Its solution will demand a longer period of time than the creation of the conditions for the full satisfaction of people's needs. It is not fortuitous that Lenin considered the fulfillment of this task the subsequent result of a completely developed, completely consolidated and established, a completely unfolded and matured Communism. (see V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 31, p. 32).

One of the most important laws of the transformation of socialism into Communism is the creation of a single Communist ownership of the means of production. Lenin pointed out that in any country a socialist revolution must deal with two kinds of production--large and small. Its first step in the economic field is the nationalization of large-scale production and the creation, in this way, of state property belonging to the entire people. But small-scale production, consisting of millions of small and petty businesses, cannot be nationalized: it can and must be transformed and joined to socialism. The only method for such a transformation is the cooperativization of small production. Lenin frequently emphasized that cooperativization under conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat conforms completely to socialism. "Under our existing system," wrote V. I. Lenin, "cooperative enterprises are distinguished from private capitalist enterprises because they are cooperative enterprises, but they are not different from socialist enterprises if they are based on land, on means of production, which belongs to the state, that is, to the working class" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 33, p. 433).

Thus Lenin looked upon the socialist economic system as a combination of two kinds of property--state property, which belongs to the whole people and is the dominant and leading type, and cooperative property. Both kinds conform to the character of the production forces under socialism and give scope for their accelerated development.

In the course of socialist construction in the USSR these principles of Lenin have been fully confirmed. In our country two forms of socialist property have been built up: state (belonging to the whole people) and kolkhoz-cooperative. The practical experience of kolkhoz construction shows that the kolkhoz-cooperative form of property, especially after the MPS [machine-tractor station] reorganization and the transfer of the machinery to the kolkhozes, promoted and will for a long time continue to promote the development of the production in agriculture.

But in the process of the transformation of socialism into Communism, and together with the progress of the further development of the production forces, kolkhoz-cooperative property will inevitably be brought closer to property belonging to the entire people, and there will inevitably take place a gradual elimination of the distinctions between them and the elimination, on this basis, of the differences between town and country.

In his report to the 21st Party Congress, N. S. Khrushchev noted that this is already today being demonstrated by such characteristic processes as the growth of the undivided kolkhoz funds, the greater and greater responsibility for agricultural activities by socialized agricultural production, the development of inter-kolkhoz production relations, the use of electrification, mechanization, and automation in agricultural production. As a result of this, there will take place a unique merger of kolkhoz means of production with state production means, and agricultural labor will gradually be transformed into a kind of industrial labor. Analyzing these processes, N. S. Khrushchev drew the following conclusions and characterized the developmental law of the creation of a single Communist property in this way: "The historically inevitable merger of the kolkhoz-cooperative property form and property belonging to the entire people will take place in the future not as a result of suppressing kolkhoz-cooperative property, but by raising the level of its social nature with the help and support of the socialist state" ("Extraordinary 21st CPSU Congress, Stenographic Report," Part I, Moscow, 1959, p. 102).

In Lenin's works can be found a profound analysis of the question of the distribution of material and spiritual wealth in the first and in the higher stages of Communist society. Lenin showed that under the transition to socialism and under conditions of socialism, distribution inevitably takes place on the basis not of need but of work. Society can at this stage guarantee equality only in relation to the means of production, by converting them into public property and eliminating, in this way, the possibility of the exploitation of man by man. But socialist society cannot yet provide equality in the field of distribution, which is here based on the principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work." Regulating the distribution of goods according to the quantity and quality of the labor expended on them, society thus tacitly recognizes the inevitable essential inequality of people.

Lenin considered that there were two basic reasons why the lower phase of Communism could not eliminate this shortcoming in the distribution of the objects of consumption:

- 1) Under socialism the level of the development of the production forces and of labor productivity does not attain a height sufficient to allow the creation of an abundance of consumption goods. And, as long as there is no such abundance, society is compelled to

control the distribution of goods, and the only form of this control is precisely the socialist principle of distribution according to work.

2) Under socialism labor becomes a profoundly conscious obligation for an overwhelming majority of toilers, but it has not yet been converted into a habit for all members of society. In this connection, society is compelled in the stage of socialism, first of all, to stimulate an increase in labor productivity with the help of the principle of material interest and, secondly, to exercise control over the amount of work and consumption also in order to eliminate thieving tendencies among that part of the population which has not yet freed itself from the egoistic psychology and individualistic habits inherited from capitalism. Lenin wrote that the coming of the higher phase of Communism presupposes "neither today's labor productivity nor today's little man who, somewhat like the seminarians in Pomyalovskiy's work, are capable 'for the fun of it' of damaging warehouses of public goods and of demanding the impossible" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 25, p. 441).

In the higher stage of Communist society the attained level of development of the production forces and labor productivity will permit the creation of an abundance of the material and spiritual wealth necessary to satisfy within rational limits all of the needs of a person. At the same time, work will become the first vital need of people; the habit of working without calculating the remuneration, under the influence of a profound understanding of the public interest --this will characterize all members of society. And all this will make possible and necessary the transition to the Communist principle of distribution which guarantees full equality and the highest justice --from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.

However, the socialist principle of distribution already represents a gigantic step forward in comparison with distribution under capitalism. In spite of the fact that the regulator of distribution under capitalism as well as under socialism is the law, and for this reason Marx and Lenin with a certain justification spoke of the preservation of "bourgeois law" under the conditions of socialism, the essence of social relations expressed in juridical form is completely different under socialism. The radical difference in the distribution of produced goods under capitalism and under socialism consists in the fact that in the capitalist society, where private ownership of the means of production prevails, distribution takes place not according to labor, but according to capital; it is regulated by the laws of cost, profit, and land rent. Thus bourgeois law legalizes the social inequality of people, that greatest of injustices which socialism destroys by establishing an equal relationship of people towards the means of production and by declaring labor, the amount and quality of labor, as the principal measure of the share of each in the distribution of the products.

But under the conditions of socialism, together with the complete development of the principle of distribution according to labor, there also arise elements of Communist distribution. This is so because in socialist society a certain amount of material and spiritual wealth is distributed among members of society independent of the quantity and quality of their labor, that is, gratis (free education and medical care for citizens; pensions; aids to large families; different kinds of free cultural service; etc.). As society moves forward to Communism and as social wealth accumulates, the number and kinds of these measures will continually increase. This developmental law is already well sketched out in the current stage of Communist construction. The size of the welfare payments received by the population of the USSR out of the state budget and from the resources of enterprises, will increase in 1960 by almost 14% compared with 1958 and will come to 244 billion rubles (*Pravda*, No. 301, 28 October 1959). For the Seven-Year Plan period as a whole these expenditures will grow from 215 billion rubles in 1958 to 360 billion in 1965; that is, by more than one and one-half times, while the real income of workers and employees, and also kolkhoz workers, will increase approximately 40% during this period. These statistics substantiate the conclusion that in the period of the transition from socialism to Communism the growth rates of the public funds for consumption will progressively outdistance the growth rates of the money incomes of the toilers, and in this way society will approach the full transition from distribution according to labor to distribution according to need.

On the other hand, under the conditions of socialism, people develop a Communist attitude toward labor. Even in the first Communist Saturdays, Lenin discerned the features of a genuinely Communist labor. In our times many toilers in socialist society find as their motivation for work not material interest but, above all, ideological devotion to the socialist system, concern for the common good, a high Communist awareness. This was manifested with special clarity in the remarkable initiative of Valentina Gaganova, who voluntarily transferred out of a leading brigade with a higher work payment into a brigade that was lagging behind, in order to help it overcome its delinquency. Describing the example set by Gaganova, N. S. Khrushchev said: "The value and nobility of this person's deed lie in the fact that she was impelled toward such a step not out of material interest, but by an idea, an ideological devotion to the Communist system" ("Plenum of the Central Committee CPSU, 24-29 June 1959, Stenographic Report," Moscow, 1959, p. 451). Gaganova's initiative was quickly transformed into a mass movement, embracing all branches of the national economy. Now, not only individual workers, kolkhoz workers, engineering-technical workers, but even whole collectives are transferring to lagging sectors of production in order to bring these sectors into the ranks of the leading ones. The broad scope of the new movement clearly confirms the conclusion of the 21st Party Congress that with the development of a socialist society and the growth of the consciousness of the masses, the

labor enthusiasm of the Soviet people increases more and more, their concern for social welfare grows, the profit instinct is shaken off, and moral incentives for work in the interests of society take on progressively greater importance (see "Extraordinary 21st Party Congress, Stenographic Report," Part II, Moscow, 1959, p. 444).

Thus, already under the conditions of socialism, on the basis of the growth of social wealth, perfection of the distribution of material and spiritual goods, and an increase in the Communist awareness of the people, conditions ripen which are necessary for the transition from the socialist to the Communist principle of distribution. When these conditions will have been fully established and consolidated in social life, society will write on its banner: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

Lenin devoted much attention to the question of the political organization of society, the fate of the socialist state in the transition to Communism. In Lenin's works the basic paths and tendencies of the development of the socialist state in the process of the construction of socialism and the transition to Communism are found.

The Marxist principle of the withering away of the state under Communism was given by Lenin a concrete and precise form in the following questions. First of all, Lenin clearly determined that the withering away of the state is an objective process, gradual and prolonged in character. Lenin considered the expression used by Marx, "the state withers away," a very happy one because "it points out both the gradualness of the process and its natural quality" (V. I. Lenin, *Soch.*, Vol. 25, p. 434). (The term used here, "natural quality," should be understood in the sense that this process will develop objectively, that is, independently of the people's will and desires. The policy of the Party and the activity of the masses which it directs can help to hasten it, but only in the framework of the given developmental law, only by utilizing it correctly.)

Lenin cautioned against vulgarian attempts to establish a precise time schedule for the withering away of the state. He pointed out that "there can be no question of setting the moment for the future 'withering away,' all the more because it is obviously by nature a prolonged process," (V. I. Lenin, *Soch.*, Vol. 25, p. 429) and that "we are within our rights to speak only of an inevitable withering away of the state, emphasizing the prolonged nature of the process, its dependence on the rapidity of the development of the higher phase of communism" (*ibid.*, p. 440).

Lenin here makes another important point, that the process of the withering away of the state cannot be culminated before the higher phase of Communist society has matured. This conclusion directly follows from an analysis of the objective historical conditions of an internal and external order which determine the necessity for a state in the course of its entire period in transition from capitalism to Communism. Lenin noted three such conditions.

First of all, he frequently emphasized that a permanent feature of the socialist revolution and the condition of its victories is the organization of the toiling masses. Therefore a socialist state from the first days of its existence takes on a function natural to it alone, the function of economic-organizational and cultural-educational work. Peculiar to it also is the function of safeguarding socialist property and the socialist legal order. The socialist state fulfills all these functions primarily by means of persuasion, with the help of social pressure. However, the necessity for the use of measures of state coercion still exists, and for this reason state organs which carry out this coercion are retained. Of course such functions as the organization of economic and cultural construction and the Communist upbringing of the younger generation never disappear from the life of society; but in the higher phase of Communism, when a high Communist consciousness, excluding the need for state discipline, will characterize all members of society, these functions will be carried out by the proper social organs, while the need for the state as a tool for organization and education will pass away.

In the second place, under the conditions of socialism, when the socialist principle of distribution according to work is in effect, the necessity continues for society to account strictly for and control the amount of labor and consumption. The only means of carrying out this accounting and control is socialist law, which plays "the role of the regulator (the determinator) of the distribution of products and the distribution of labor among members of society (*ibid.*, p. 439)". But as long as law remains under socialism and down to the transition to the Communist principle of distribution according to need, "so long does the necessity for a state remain which, safeguarding public ownership of the means of production, safeguards the equality of labor and the equality of the division of the products" (*ibid.*). Thus in this case the withering away of the state was associated by Lenin with the transition to the Communist principle of distribution according to need, when the necessity for society to regulate the amount of products received by each will pass away.

In the third place, the Communist formation begins to develop in the conditions of a sharp class struggle, called forth by the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes and of a petty-bourgeois anarchistic element. In order to suppress this resistance and to bring about a decisive liquidation of the antagonistic classes, organized force is necessary, and this force can only be the proletarian dictatorship, the socialist state.

In connection with the liquidation of the exploiting classes, as the first phase of Communism is being built up, the need for suppressing class enemies within the country disappears, and therefore the need for the state passes away. However, the class struggle continues on a world scale. It follows from Lenin's principle of the impossibility of the simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries that, even after

the full and conclusive victory of socialism in several countries and after they begin carrying out the transition to Communism, a number of countries still may remain in the capitalist stage of development. Therefore the class struggle will continue in the international arena as a struggle in the economic, political, and ideological fields between the socialist system, which is developing along the road to Communism, and the capitalist system, which is dying but is still in existence. While this struggle continues, the necessity for a state continues, the necessity for its functions of safeguarding the country (or the whole system) from the threat of aggression by the imperialist powers and struggling against attempts to undermine from without the might of the socialist camp.

Lenin's principles, which were later developed in the decisions of our Party, are confirmed by the historical development of the contemporary period. Today there is no capitalist encirclement of our country. There are two world systems--the socialist and the capitalist. In the competition of these systems the correlation of forces are changing more and more to the advantage of socialism, and nothing in the world can any longer restore capitalism in the USSR or destroy the socialist camp. But while the aggressive imperialist camp exists, there is no guarantee against the possibility of aggression by the powers in that camp, and the subversive activity of the reactionary forces against the countries of socialism continues as well. In these conditions, as the 21st Party Congress emphasized, the tasks of the socialist state in the field of the defense of peace and the defense of the country against the threat of an attack by the imperialist powers are especially important and significant: "The functions of defending the socialist fatherland, which are today being fulfilled by the state," it is pointed out in the resolutions of the Congress, "can wither away only when the danger of an attack by the imperialists is completely eliminated" ("Extraordinary 21st Party Congress, Stenographic Report," Part II, Moscow, 1959, p. 446).

So, proceeding from Lenin's instructions, the Communist Party associates the withering away of the state as a weapon in the class struggle with the liquidation of the antagonistic classes and the victory of Communism on a world scale.

Leaving open the question of the timetables and the concrete forms for the withering away of the state under the transition to Communism, Lenin defined the general outlook for the development and subsequent withering away of the socialist state.

As far back as the Communist Manifesto of K. Marx and F. Engels, the idea was presented that the socialist state, being in essence the dictatorship of the proletariat, would take the form of a democracy. Developing this idea, Lenin emphasized that the dictatorship of the proletariat, for all the varieties of its state form, would always and in all countries have a single common form--it would be a state of a higher type of democracy. Under the conditions of

socialist democracy, and as it evolves forward, social functions would progressively be transformed from political functions, entrusted to the state, into simple administrative functions, carried out by society without a special apparatus of coercion. In this connection, it was Lenin who noted that "at a certain stage of its withering away, one may call the state which is withering away a nonpolitical state" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 25, p. 410). When this process is completed and when the possibility offered by socialist democracy of the universal participation of all citizens in the administration of public affairs becomes a complete reality, only then does the need for state administration and for democracy itself disappear. Lenin wrote that "victorious socialism cannot arrest its victory and cannot lead mankind to the withering away of the state without the fullest realization of democracy" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 23, p. 63), and "in communist society democracy, by being regenerated and transformed into habit, will wither away." (ibid., Vol. 28, p. 221)

The withering away of the state after the complete development of socialist democracy--this is Lenin's formula for the withering away of the socialist state under Communism. Lenin's ideas on the fate of the socialist state under the transition to Communism have been embodied in the decisions of the 21st Party Congress. The Congress noted that one of the laws of the transition to Communism is the development of the socialist state system into Communist social self-administration. In the period of the extensive construction of Communism the main direction in the development of the socialist state system, which guarantees the preparation of the conditions for the influence of this law, is the broadest unfolding of democracy, attracting all citizens to participation in the leadership of economic and cultural construction, in the administration of the public business. Already today several functions of state organs are either being transferred wholly to social organizations, or are being fulfilled by them in parallel with state organs. At the same time, the 21st Congress, proceeding from Lenin's thesis on the withering away of the state only with the complete victory of Communism, noted: "The transfer of individual functions from state organs to public organizations will not weaken the role of the socialist state in the construction of Communism, but will broaden and strengthen the political foundation of socialist society, will guarantee the further development of socialist democracy" ("Extraordinary 21st CPSU Congress, Stenographic Report," Part II, Moscow, 1959, p. 445).

Analyzing the conditions and laws of the socialist revolution in the epoch of imperialism, Lenin deduced the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country, taken by itself. From this it followed that at the given stage of world history the victory of socialism simultaneously in all countries was impossible. But Lenin never inferred from his deduction that the socialist system would exist in one country alone for a prolonged period of time. Lenin pointed out that the formation of the Communist system would begin with the decay

of the world capitalist system, with the subsequent withdrawal from it of a number of countries and their transition to the path of socialism, which would lead to the establishment of the world socialist system. Under socialism, Lenin wrote, a culmination would come to the tendency "toward the creation of a single world economy as a whole, regulated by the proletariat of all nations according to a common plan" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 31, p. 125).

Lenin's prediction is being fulfilled in our time. Several years after the complete victory of the socialist system in the USSR, a number of countries of Europe and Asia set out on the path of socialism. In an exceptionally short time the world socialist system was established, which is taking the form of a unified whole both in the political and economic sense.

In his time, Lenin charted the basic paths for the movement of various nations to socialism. His instructions on the eradication of the real inequality of the peoples of our country sketched out the future course of the equalization of the level of the economic, political, and cultural development of all the Soviet republics. At the same time, Lenin gave a scientific basis to the principle of the possibility of the development of backward countries toward socialism, while bypassing the capitalist stage of development (*ibid.*, p. 219).

The experience of socialist construction in a number of areas in the Soviet East, as well as in Mongolia and several areas of China, confirm this Leninist principle. At the same time, the creation of a single economic system and a socialist commonwealth of nations in the Soviet Union was the model for the formation of that world socialist economy about which Lenin wrote. The experience of our country, and later of the whole socialist camp, proved that with the transition of various peoples to socialism as a result of the action of the law of a planned, balanced development, an equalization takes place in the general line of the economic and cultural development of all socialist nations. This means that in the framework of the accelerated development of the socialist system, those peoples who had been economically backward in the past, by relying on the experience of the advanced countries and on cooperation and mutual help, develop at comparatively faster rates of speed, quickly make up lost time, and pull themselves up to the level of the advanced countries. The result is the formation of a single front of the general movement of all socialist countries toward Communism.

Lenin did not and could not raise the question of the nature of the transition to Communism by the world socialist system as a whole, which was not in existence in Lenin's time. Now that the world socialist system has been formed and consolidated, now that in all of its countries the full victory of socialism is close at hand, the question of how the development of socialist countries to Communism will proceed further is of current significance. The answer to this question was given by the 21st Party Congress. In his report to the Congress, N. S.

Khrushchev announced: "It is theoretically more correct to assume that the countries of socialism, by successfully utilizing the potentialities intrinsic in the socialist system, will pass over into the higher phase of Communist society more or less simultaneously" ("Extraordinary 21st CPSU Congress, Stenographic Report," Part I, Moscow, 1959, pp. 107-108).

Thus the 21st Party Congress determined the more or less simultaneous transition of the socialist countries to Communism as a new developmental law of the transformation of socialism into Communism. This theoretical conclusion is of tremendous mobilizing importance. It opens before all the peoples of the socialist camp a clear vista of the struggle for the establishment of the new social system.

The movement of the socialist countries toward Communism along a united front does not exclude a variety of concrete means, measures, and forms for carrying out the general laws of this movement. The lower phase of Communism cannot completely eliminate the objectively existing differences in Communist construction in the various countries. One or another difference will continue to exist for a long time, down to the victory of Communism on a world scale and the subsequent union of nations. But this does not affect the main thing--the general laws of the transformation of socialism into Communism, which were discovered by Marxist-Leninist science and which, without exception, will be in force in all countries entering the path of the transition to the higher phase of Communist society.

* * *

Lenin was profoundly convinced of the full victory of Communism. He wrote that "the cause of communism in Russia is immutable" (Leninskiy sbornik [Lenin Collection], XXXV, p. 248). In the first years of Soviet power, when the flames of civil war had not yet been extinguished, Lenin, addressing the youth, spoke with great emotion about how the young Communist generation would build, on the ground cleared away by the October Revolution, a Communist society in Russia. He called upon youth to convert Communism into leadership for practical work (see V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 31, p. 265).

Lenin clearly saw the main objective and subjective factors guaranteeing the possibility of a successful building of Communism. For Lenin these factors were, above all, the production relations of socialist society and its great advantages, on the base of which an historically unprecedented social progress was ensured. Lenin wrote that, by itself, the transfer of the means of production to public ownership "will inevitably bring about a gigantic development of the production forces of human society" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 25, p. 440).

The flourishing of social production under socialism creates the material foundation for the active participation of the multi-million popular masses in Communist construction. The conscious historical creativity of the people was considered by Lenin as a manifestation of

the advantages of socialism and as a condition of its rapid transformation into Communism. When the entire people will move together with its vanguard, the Communist Party, Lenin said that then "there will be an acceleration of this movement of such a kind that we today cannot even conceive of" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 33, p. 243).

In the Communist Party Lenin saw the main political force of the building of a Communist society. Only the Party, armed with the knowledge of the laws of objective development, Lenin taught--only the Party, hardened in struggle and possessing the experience of organizing the masses, can lead society to the bright heights of Communism. Lenin decisively struggled against all those who tried to belittle the role of the Party in Communist construction. He emphasized that the leading and directing role of the Party grows all the way down to the full victory of Communism. Exposing the German "left" Communists who made a distinction between the Communist Party and the working class and denied the Party's role in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the struggle for Communism, Lenin wrote in 1922: "To deny party spirit from the point of view of communism means to make a leap from the eve of the collapse of capitalism (in Germany), a leap not to the lower nor to the middle, but to the higher phase of communism" (V. I. Lenin, Soch., Vol. 31, p. 26). This Leninist principle is fully substantiated by history. "The entire experience of the struggle for the victory of socialism and Communism," it says in the decisions of the 21st Party Congress, "shows that in the process of the building of a Communist society the role of the Party, as the experienced vanguard of the people and the highest form of social organization, grows progressively larger" ("Extraordinary 21st Party Congress, Stenographic Report," Part II, Moscow, 1959, p. 452).

The enhanced role of the Communist Party as a necessary and decisive condition for the building and development of Communism is manifested with particular clarity in the present stage of Communist construction. Having outlined for the impending 7-year period a grandiose plan for the creation of the foundations of Communism, the Party is now transferring the center of gravity to the organizational work of mobilizing the masses for the practical solution of the tasks of the Seven-Year Plan. It is bringing the idea of the struggle for Communism to the consciousness of the masses in the form of concrete tasks of economic and cultural construction; it is organizing and directing the efforts of all the Soviet people for their solution.

In the wise leadership and organizational activity of the Party, in its fidelity to Leninism, is the guarantee of new successes for Communism.